UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,133	09/12/2003	Jeffrey George	60518-164	7757

27305	7590	06/01/2006		

EXAMINER
HOEL, MATTHEW D

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.
THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101
39400 WOODWARD AVENUE
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3713	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/661,133	GEORGE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew D. Hoel	3713	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 March 2006_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-105_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _20-30 and 74-77_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19,31-63,65-73,78,79 and 84-105_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _64 and 80-83_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _09/12/2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _01/16/04,05/20/05_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on Mar. 14th,

2006, is acknowledged. Claims 20 to 30 and 74 to 77 of Group II are withdrawn from

consideration. The non-elected claims will have to be cancelled should the application

come to issue.

Double Patenting

2.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created
doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the
unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent
and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory
obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims
are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct
from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated
by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140
F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29
USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.
1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422
F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163
USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d)
may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory
double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to
be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of
activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a
terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with
37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,129 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '129 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '129 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '129. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user

(player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '129 (Claim 1). The advantage of

this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the

players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific

demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

4.   This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

5.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,131 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '131 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '131 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '131. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user

(player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '131 (Claim 1). The advantage of

this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the

players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific

demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

6.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

7.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,140 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '140 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '140 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device (data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58, Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network interface of '140. '695 is able to receive player identification information from the user in response to the user being in attendance at an event (player tracking system, Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like '140 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

8.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

9.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/661,145 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '145 claims all of the elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '145 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '145. '695 is able to process an alert (special event with enhanced chance

of winning, Col. 18, Line 64 to Col. 19, Line 12), like '145 (Claim 1). The advantage of

this combination would be to enhance players' interest in the game by informing them of

enhanced opportunities to win higher jackpots.

10.   This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

11.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,233 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '233 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '233 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '233. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like

'233 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's

profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to

the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

12. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

13.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,390 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '390 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '390 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '390. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like

'390 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's

profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to

the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

14.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

15.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,391 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '391 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '391 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '391. '695 teaches table rating information (activity at and amounts bet at

tables, Col. 3, Lines 42 to 60), like '391 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination

would be to enhance players' interest in the game by informing them of the betting

activity at various tables, which could encourage players to play at tables with high

betting levels in hopes of increasing their odds of winning.

16.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

17.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,395 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '395 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '395 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '395. '695 teaches maintaining cash ticket information (hand paying

jackpots in cash as opposed to cashless cards or accounts, 112, Fig. 6), like '395

(Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the security of the

gaming system by verifying the amounts of the cash jackpots awarded to the players.

18.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

19.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,392 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '392 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '392 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '392. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like

'392 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's

profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to

the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

20.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

21.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,450 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '450 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '450 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '450. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like

'450 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's

profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to

the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

22.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

23.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/662,101 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '101 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '101 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '101. '695 teaches a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65), like

'101 (Claim 1). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the casino's

profitability by customizing the players' gaming experience by marketing the games to

the players' specific demographics ('695, Col. 13, Lines 17 to 27).

24.   This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

25.   Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/661,865 in view of Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2). '865 claims all of the

elements of Claim 1, but lacks specificity as to the gaming system having at least one

gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer including a database for

maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device, the remote

device receiving data, the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device, and the data

including jackpot information to process the jackpot. '865 claims a remote system for

use with a gaming system, a remote device, and a remote network interface (Claim 1).

'695, however, teaches the gaming system having at least one gaming machine

capable of issuing a jackpot (Figs. 1 and 2), the host computer being coupled to the at

least one gaming machine by a network (Fig. 1), the host computer including a

database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one gaming device

(data maintenance unit, Fig. 2), the remote device receiving data (external value

modification, Fig. 2), the remote network interface being coupled to the remote device

for exchanging data between the host computer and the remote device (Fig. 1), and the

data including jackpot information to process the jackpot (Fig. 2; jackpot parameters 58,

Fig. 4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the database and

player identification information of '695 to the remote device and remote network

interface of '865. '695 teaches a voucher for an associated product (players can win

casino comps for products and services, Col. 4, Lines 38 to 47), like '865 (Claim 1).

The advantage of this combination would be to stimulate players' interest in the game

by allowing them to select their prizes from a variety of goods and services.

26.   This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 3 cites "and

IEEE 802.11 standard" in the second line (emphasis added). The examiner believes

the applicants intend to cite "an IEEE 802.11 standard. Appropriate correction is

required.

2.   Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 55 cites "and

IEEE 802.11 standard" in the second line (emphasis added). The examiner believes

the applicants intend to cite "an IEEE 802.11 standard. Appropriate correction is

required.

3.   Claim 56 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 56 cites an

IEEE 802.11b standard, which is a subset of the IEEE 802.11 standard of Claim 55, so

the examiner believes the applicants intend Claim 56 to depend from Claim 55 instead

of Claim 54.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 is dependent from Claim 4. The examiner believes the applicants intend for Claim 5 to depend from Claim 3, as the wireless connection can only be either IEEE 802.11b or IEEE 802.11g, not both at the same time. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mothwurf, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,695 B2).

3.   As to Claim 1: '695 teaches a remote system for use with a gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, a host

computer coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer

including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one

gaming device (Abst., Fig. 2). The remote system comprises a remote device for

receiving data (jackpot controller on Ethernet network, Fig. 1). The remote system also

comprises a remote network interface coupled to the remote device for exchanging the

data between the host computer and the remote device, the data including jackpot

information for processing the jackpot (jackpot information, Fig. 4; jackpot configuration

on network, Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
        obviousness or nonobviousness.

6.   Claims 2 to 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

'695 in view of Paulsen, et al. (U.S. patent 6,712,698 B2).

7.   As to Claim 2: '695 discloses all of the elements of Claim 2, but lacks specificity as to the remote device being coupled to the remote network interface by a wireless connection. '698, however, teaches the remote device being coupled to the remote network by a wireless connection (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the wireless interface of '698 to the networked jackpot system of '695. '695 has a player tracking system (Col. 23, Lines 57 to 65). The player tracking system of '698 is implemented with a wireless network (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). The advantage of this combination would be to reduce the cabling required to implement the networked system by using wireless connections.

8.   As to Claim 3: The wireless system of '698 uses an IEEE 802.11 standard (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

9.   As to Claim 4: The wireless system of '698 uses IEEE 802.11b (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

10.   As to Claim 5: '698 discloses a wireless 802.11 networked interface. '698 does not address the wireless networked interface being 802.11g, however the networked wireless interface can be 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11c, 802.11d, 802.11e, etc. (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60). The applicants have not disclosed that having the interface being 802.11g solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that the 802.11g interface of '698, or the 802.11a interface of the applicants' invention would perform equally well. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '698 such that the wireless network interface is 802.11g because such a

modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to

patentably distinguish over '698.

11.   Claims 6 to 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

'695 and '698 in view of Fin, et al. (U.S. patent 6,240,444 B1).

12.   As to Claim 6: The combination of '695 and '698 discloses all of the elements of

Claim 6, but lacks specificity as to the remote device having a web client for interaction

with a user. '695 teaches in Fig. 1 a floor server with jackpot configuration information.

It is inherent that such a server would have a processor. '444, however, teaches a

remote device having a web client for interaction with a user (Abst., Fig. 1). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the web client of '444 to the remote

system of '695 and '698. '695 states that the jackpot system can be implemented with

the CRYSTAL WEB ™ system of GRIPS GmbH of Germany. The cited relevant art of

'444 lists the article "Crystal Web—A Distributed Authoring Environment for the World-

Wide Web," Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, vol. 27, 1995, pp. 861-870. While

'444 does not further cite CRYSTAL WEB ™, the invention specified is precisely that—a

distributed authoring environment implemented over the Web (Abst.; Figs. 11 to 13; Col.

2, Lines 22 to 32). The remote jackpot system of '695 is implemented over an Ethernet

network; at the time of invention, most networked applications using an Ethernet

network would use web browser interfaces. The advantage of this combination would

be to enhance the ease of use of the jackpot system by providing a Web browser

interface that users are familiar with.

13.   As to Claim 7: The web client of '444 acquires input from the user and formats

and presents data to the user (Figs. 11 to 13).

14.   As to Claim 8: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot form (hit criteria,

Fig. 10). The remote network interface sends the jackpot form to the remote device

(external inputs, Fig. 2, Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

15.   As to Claim 9: The jackpot form of '695 has jackpot fields selectable by the user

(fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21,

35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the

jackpot information to the remote network interface located on a host computer (external

modifications made to data management unit, Fig. 2).

16.   As to Claim 10: The remote device of '444 has a web client for interaction with a

user (Figs. 11 to 13). The remote device of '444 has a processor (Fig. 1). The jackpot

form of '695 is accessible over a web client (CRYSTAL WEB ™ system, Col. 2, Lines 1

to 9).

17.   As to Claim 11: '695 teaches a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 5). The form is

accessible over a network (external modifications, Fig. 2). '444 teaches a form

accessible over a Web page (Figs. 11 to 13).

18.   As to Claim 12: The jackpot form of '695 is fillable with jackpot information by a

user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to

21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the

jackpot information to the remote network interface (external modifications, Fig. 2).

19.   As to Claim 13: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various

jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface

determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34

to 46).

20.   As to Claim 14: The jackpot of '695 may be triggered by a casino employee (Col.

16, Lines 36 to 47).

21.   As to Claim 15: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot entry button

(manual input, Col. 16, Lines 47 to 49) for selection by the user. The jackpot id is

entered manually (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47). The remote

device sends a notification that the jackpot entry button is selected (external hit

generation, Fig. 2). The remote network interface determines if the jackpot id is valid

upon receiving the notification (hit event validated, Fig. 5).

22.   Claims 16 to 19, 31 to 63, 65 to 73, 78, 79, and 84 to 105 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '695, '698, and '444 in view of Brunner (U.S.

patent 6,681,984 B2).

23.   As to Claim 16: The combination of '695, '698, and '444 discloses all of the

elements of Claim 16, but lacks specificity as to the remote device having a barcode

reader for reading a barcode on the jackpot. '984, however, teaches a barcode reader

for reading a barcode on the jackpot and determining the jackpot information (Col. 4,

Lines 14 to 17). The remote interface receives the jackpot information from the barcode

reader (optically scanned, Fig. 5). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to apply the barcode reader of '984 to the jackpot system of the combination of '695, '698, and '444. '695 has a handpay option for distributing the jackpot to the winner (112, Fig. 6). Fig. 5 or '984 has a handpay routine in which an attendant gives the jackpot slip to the security guard and hands the prize money to the player. An electronic file of the jackpot is transmitted to the casino computer of '984 (Fig. 5). The same is done in '695 (external hit generation, Fig. 2). The advantage of this combination would be to enhance the security of the jackpot distribution by having a barcode on the jackpot slip, as it is not human-legible, and thus difficult to counterfeit.

24.   As to Claim 17: '984 displays data concerning any mismatches (Fig. 6).

25.   As to Claim 18: The remote network interface of '695 is able to retrieve jackpot details from the host computer as a function of jackpot id (casino management accessing data management unit; 20, 24, 30, Fig. 2; Col. 10, Lines 24 to 67).

26.   As to Claim 19: The jackpot form of '695 has a jackpot button for selection by the user (Col. 16, Lines 36 to 49). The remote device sends a notification that the jackpot button is selected and stores the notification to the host computer (trigger from external source, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 38, Fig. 2). The host computer updates the data in the database (prizes unavailable if already won, (Col. 16, Line 61 to Col. 17, Line 8).

27.   As to Claim 31: '984 teaches jackpot information including a jackpot fill identifier (Fig. 2). The remote interface retrieves fill detail from the host computer as a function of the jackpot fill identifier (optical data scanned and matched by PC, Fig. 6).

28.   As to Claim 32: '984 teaches a fill detail including gaming machine id (32, Fig. 2).

29.   As to Claim 33: The fill slip of '984 indicates the stand the slot machine is located

in (32, Fig. 2).

30.   As to Claim 34: The fill slip of '984 indicates a gaming date (22, Fig. 2).

31.   As to Claim 35: The fill detail of '984 indicates a gaming shift (swing shift, Fig. 4).

32.   As to Claim 36: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot value on the

accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

33.   As to Claim 37: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot status on the

accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

34.   As to Claim 38: The jackpot status of '984 includes a request status (status

indicated by being signed off, Fig. 3).

35.   As to Claim 39: The jackpot status of '984 includes an acknowledge status

(signed off after being acknowledged, Fig. 3).

36.   As to Claim 40: The jackpot status of '984 includes a process status (slip

contents matched with contents of electronic file transmitted to casino computer, Fig. 5).

37.   As to Claim 41: The jackpot status of '984 includes a paid status (amount paid by

machine or hand, Fig. 1).

38.   As to Claim 42: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot identifier (sequence

number, Fig. 3).

39.   As to Claim 43: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot status (amount paid

by machine or hand, Fig. 1).

40.   As to Claim 44: The remote device of '984 sends a notification that the jackpot

identifier is selected, the remote network interface retrieving the jackpot detail from the

host computer as a function of the jackpot identifier (jackpot slipped scanned at PC and

compared to information transmitted by the gaming machine to the casino computer,

Fig. 5).

41.   As to Claim 45: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine id (slot and

stand number, Fig. 1).

42.   As to Claim 46: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine location

(stand number, Fig. 1).

43.   As to Claim 47: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine game

(machine number, Fig. 1; "slot" indicating type of game being played, Fig. 1).

44.   As to Claim 48: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine

denomination (Fig. 3).

45.   As to Claim 49: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming date (Fig. 3).

46.   As to Claim 50: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming shift (day shift,

Fig. 1).

47.   As to Claim 51: The remote device of '695 sends a notification that the jackpot

status is selected, the remote network interface advances the jackpot status via the host

computer as a function of the prior jackpot status, and the remote network interface

sends the advanced jackpot status to the remote device (jackpot capable of triggering a

jackpot in another jackpot system, Col. 17, Line 60 to Col. 18, Line 3).

48.   As to Claim 52: The remote device of '695 displays the advanced jackpot status

(jackpot status displayed Col. 11, Lines 23 to 34).

49.   As to Claim 53: '695 teaches a remote system for use with a gaming system, the

gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of issuing a jackpot, a host

computer coupled to the at least one gaming machine by a network, the host computer

including a database for maintaining jackpot information relating to the at least one

gaming device (Abst., Fig. 2). The remote system comprises a remote device for

receiving data (jackpot controller on Ethernet network, Fig. 1). The remote system also

comprises a remote network interface coupled to the remote device for exchanging the

data between the host computer and the remote device, the data including jackpot

information for processing the jackpot (jackpot information, Fig. 4; jackpot configuration

on network, Fig. 1). '695 teaches a method for processing a jackpot for use with a

gaming system, the gaming system having at least one gaming machine capable of ·

issuing the jackpot (Abst., Fig. 2). '695 teaches sending a selectable form to a remote

device (external value modification, Fig. 2; fields can be set according to criteria of

casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines

6 to 12). The user selects data from the form on the remote device for processing the

jackpot (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20

to 21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12).

50.   As to Claim 54: '695 teaches the gaming system including a host computer and a

remote network interface for coupling he remote device to the host computer (Figs. 1

and 2). '698 teaches the remote device being coupled to the remote network by a

wireless connection (Col. 3, Lines 44 to 60).

51.   As to Claim 55: The wireless system of '698 uses an IEEE 802.11 standard (Col.

3, Lines 44 to 60).

52.   As to Claim 56: The wireless system of '698 uses IEEE 802.11b (Col. 3, Lines 44

to 60).

53.   As to Claim 57: '698 discloses a wireless 802.11 networked interface. '698 does

not address the wireless networked interface being 802.11g, however the networked

wireless interface can be 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11c, 802.11d, 802.11e, etc. (Col. 3,

Lines 44 to 60). The applicants have not disclosed that having the interface being

802.11g solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it

appears that the 802.11g interface of '698, or the 802.11a interface of the applicants'

invention would perform equally well. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified '698 such that the wireless network interface is 802.11g because such a

modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to

patentably distinguish over '698.

54.   As to Claim 58: '695 teaches in Fig. 1 a floor server with jackpot configuration

information. It is inherent that such a server would have a processor. '444 teaches a

remote device having a web client for interaction with a user (Abst., Fig. 1).

55.   As to Claim 59: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot form (hit criteria,

Fig. 10). The remote network interface sends the jackpot form to the remote device

(external inputs, Fig. 2, Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

56.   As to Claim 60: The jackpot form of '695 has jackpot fields selectable by the user

(fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to 21,

35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the

jackpot information to the remote network interface located on a host computer (external

modifications made to data management unit, Fig. 2).

57.   As to Claim 61: The remote device of '444 has a web client for interaction with a

user (Figs. 11 to 13). The remote device of '444 has a processor (Fig. 1). The jackpot

form of '695 is accessible over a web client (CRYSTAL WEB ™ system, Col. 2, Lines 1

to 9).

58.   As to Claim 62: '695 teaches a jackpot form (hit criteria, Fig. 5). The form is

accessible over a network (external modifications, Fig. 2). '444 teaches a form

accessible over a Web page (Figs. 11 to 13).

59.   As to Claim 63: The jackpot form of '695 is fillable with jackpot information by a

user (fields can be set according to criteria of casino management, Col. 15, Lines 20 to

21, 35 to 39, 43 to 47, 55 to 59, Col. 16, Lines 6 to 12). The remote device sends the

jackpot information to the remote network interface (external modifications, Fig. 2).

60.   As to Claim 65: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various

jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface

determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34

to 46).

61.   As to Claim 66: The jackpot of '695 may be triggered by a casino employee (Col.

16, Lines 36 to 47).

62.   As to Claim 67: The remote system of '695 includes a jackpot entry button

(manual input, Col. 16, Lines 47 to 49) for selection by the user. The jackpot id is

entered manually (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47).

63.   As to Claim 68: '695 teaches submitting the jackpot id entered manually to the.

remote network interface (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47;

external hit generation, Fig. 2).

64.   As to Claim 69: '695 teaches the step of sending a notification that the jackpot

entry button is selected (jackpot triggered by employee, Col. 16, Lines 36 to 47; external

hit generation, Fig. 2).

65.   As to Claim 70: The jackpot information of '695 includes a jackpot id (various

jackpots associated with numbers 1 to 6, Fig. 7). The remote network interface

determines if the jackpot id is valid (hit determined to be valid, Fig. 5, Col. 17, Lines 34

to 46).

66.   As to Claim 71: '984, however, teaches a barcode reader for reading a barcode

on the jackpot and determining the jackpot information (Col. 4, Lines 14 to 17). The

remote interface receives the jackpot information from the barcode reader (optically

scanned, Fig. 5).

67.   As to Claim 72: '984 displays data concerning any mismatches (Fig. 6).

68.   As to Claim 73: '695 teaches data related to the jackpot processing system being

stored in a database stored on a host computer (data management unit, Fig. 2). '695

includes a remote network interface coupled to the database for retrieving and storing

data therein (external value modification, Fig. 2; Col. 10, Lines 51 to 55).

69.   As to Claim 78: '695 receives, by the remote network interface, responsive data

and transmits the data to the remote device (data management unit receiving external

input, Fig. 2).

70.   As to Claim 79: '444 teaches a remote device with a web client for interaction

with a user, and formatting, by the remote network interface, the responsive data into a

hypertext mark-up language for display by the web client (Figs. 11 to 13).

71.   As to Claim 84: '984 teaches jackpot information including a jackpot fill identifier

(Fig. 2). The remote interface retrieves fill detail from the host computer as a function of

the jackpot fill identifier (optical data scanned and matched by PC, Fig. 6).

72.   As to Claim 85: '984 teaches a fill detail including gaming machine id (32, Fig. 2).

73.   As to Claim 86: The fill slip of '984 indicates the stand the slot machine is located

in (32, Fig. 2).

74.   As to Claim 87: The fill slip of '984 indicates a gaming date (22, Fig. 2).

75.   As to Claim 88: The fill detail of '984 indicates a gaming shift (swing shift, Fig. 4).

76.   As to Claim 89: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot value on the

accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

77.   As to Claim 90: The fill detail of '984 indicates a jackpot status on the

accompanying jackpot slip (Fig. 3).

78.   As to Claim 91: The jackpot status of '984 includes a request status (status

indicated by being signed off, Fig. 3).

79.   As to Claim 92: The jackpot status of '984 includes an acknowledge status

(signed off after being acknowledged, Fig. 3).

80.   As to Claim 93: The jackpot status of '984 includes a process status (slip

contents matched with contents of electronic file transmitted to casino computer, Fig. 5).

81.   As to Claim 94: The jackpot status of '984 includes a paid status (amount paid by

machine or hand, Fig. 1).

82.   As to Claim 95: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot identifier (sequence

number, Fig. 3).

83.   As to Claim 96: The jackpot field of '984 includes a jackpot status (amount paid

by machine or hand, Fig. 1).

84.   As to Claim 97: The remote device of '984 sends a notification that the jackpot

identifier is selected, the remote network interface retrieving the jackpot detail from the

host computer as a function of the jackpot identifier (jackpot slipped scanned at PC and

compared to information transmitted by the gaming machine to the casino computer,

Fig. 5).

85.   As to Claim 98: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine id (slot and

stand number, Fig. 1).

86.   As to Claim 99: The jackpot detail of '984 includes a gaming machine location

(stand number, Fig. 1).

87.   As to Claim 100: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine game

(machine number, Fig. 1; "slot" indicating type of game being played, Fig. 1).

88.   As to Claim 101: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming machine

denomination (Fig. 3).

89.   As to Claim 102: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming date (Fig. 3).

90.   As to Claim 103: The jackpot detail of '984 includes the gaming shift (day shift,

Fig. 1).

91.   As to Claim 104: The remote device of '695 sends a notification that the jackpot

status is selected, the remote network interface advances the jackpot status via the host

computer as a function of the prior jackpot status, and the remote network interface

sends the advanced jackpot status to the remote device (jackpot capable of triggering a

jackpot in another jackpot system, Col. 17, Line 60 to Col. 18, Line 3).

92.   As to Claim 105: The remote device of '695 displays the advanced jackpot status

(jackpot status displayed Col. 11, Lines 23 to 34).

Allowable Subject Matter

93.   Claims 64 and 80 to 83 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not suggest

an error display if all require information is not entered, servlets, a login layer, or a menu

layer in conjunction with the elements of the rejected claims.

Specification

94.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The cross-

reference to related applications needs to be updated to reflect the application number

of the provisional application, 60/502,179.

95.   Appropriate correction is required.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

96.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Brunner in U.S. pre-grant publication 2003/0057269 A1 teaches

a gaming cash management method. Mothwurf, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publications

2004/0229683 A1, 2005/0070356 A1, and 2001/0036857 A1 teach a jackpot system.

Schober, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publication 2004/0209692 A1 teach a gaming system.

Torango in U.S. patent 6,435,968 B1 and U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0042297 A1

teaches a progressive wagering system.

Conclusion

97.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Hoel whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5961. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri., 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

98.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

99.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew D. Hoel, Patent Examiner
AU 3713

XUAN M. THAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC3700